



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## BOOK REVIEWS

---

*The Fragments of Sophocles.* Edited with additional notes from the papers of Sir R. C. Jebb and Dr. W. G. Headlam by A. C. PEARSON. Cambridge: University Press, 1917.

The completion of Jebb's *Sophocles* by these three volumes on the fragments with a comprehensive index would be a notable achievement of scholarship in any year. In the year 1917 it is particularly impressive. Students of Mr. Pearson's *Fragments of Zeno and Cleanthes* and of his excellent editions of the *Helena* and the *Heraclidae* expected him to prove equal to the burden which the deaths of Jebb and of Headlam imposed upon him. They will not be disappointed. He has made use of and given credit to the *Adversaria* of Headlam and the lecture notes of Jebb. But the work as it stands is essentially his. And the student will pass to it and back again to the plays with no sense of inequality. A great monument of English scholarship is worthily completed.

These three volumes are something more than a sufficient critical and exegetical commentary on the entire body of Sophoclean fragments—though they are eminently that. They will remain one of the works to which the wise student frequently recurs both as storehouses of knowledge and as illustrations of sound method. Mr. Pearson's annotation combines the best traditions of English virtuosity with the patient industry that leaves few German or American monographs unexplored. He has a sound feeling for Greek idiom and the niceties of Greek usage, and he has one advantage even over Jebb in his familiarity with the ideas and the vocabulary of Greek philosophy. His commentary does not stop with the indispensable minimum of exegesis but often goes on to illustrate and illuminate the principle of language involved or sketch the history of an idea or sentiment. I may instance the notes on *λευκὴν ἡμέραν*, fr. 6, on *σοφοὶ τύραννοι*, 14, on *στερνόμαντις*, 59, on *πινοτήρης*, 113, on *νέμειν* and *ἀπονέμειν*, 144, on *σαρδάνιος γέλως*, 160, on Plouton and Plutos, 273, on the trick of the Polypus, 307, on *ὄνον σκιά*, 331, on *ἀνταῖον*, 334, on the "third to the Saviour," 425, on *ποδαπός*, 453, on *παρὰ στάθμην*, 474, on *πολύφθοροι*, 555.5, on armpitting, 623, on *δαίμων*, 653, on the shadow of Mt. Athos, 776, on *αἷμα κτείνας*, 799, on *λαίθαργος*, 885, and on the spurious fragments 1122 and 1128.

The commentary, rich as it is, was perhaps the lesser half of the labor of preparing these volumes. A general introductory essay of a hundred pages studies the history of the text and the sources of the fragments with a full if not absolutely exhaustive bibliography. The introductions to the separate

titles involved, in addition to the discussion of the myths, the possible reconstruction of the plots and the hypotheses of modern scholars in relation to some hundred distinct plays. Here Mr. Pearson had the guidance of Welcker, of whom he generously says: "Welcker's book is as readable to-day as when it was first printed. He had spared no exertion in sifting the whole of the data provided by the mythographical authorities, and in comparing them with the relevant indications of the tragic fragments. On the basis of this evidence the plots were reconstructed with remarkable acuteness; and the results, though necessarily often conjectural, can be checked, even where they fail to convince, by the openly displayed material of the sources quoted."

While taking account, however, of all the material collected by Welcker and Nauck and the more adventurous Hartung, Mr. Pearson is not dependent upon them. Each of his introductions is a little independent monograph brought down to date. And they are on the whole singularly free from the prevailing vice of modern scholarship—the indiscriminate commingling of hypothesis and fact. They present to us the facts as actually known and leave us free to accept or reject the author's conjectural interpretation of them. It is impossible to enter into this detail here. I will conclude, then, with a few of the suggestions that have occurred to me in the reading of the notes.

Fr. 3: *ἐψία*. In the gloss of Hesychius Mr. Pearson takes *ἔφοδος* as "transition" (of the meaning) in an etymology referring to Plut. *Moral.* 1055 f. (should be 1035 f.) and Diog. Laert. 6. 31. These passages hardly justify the meaning. Is not *ἔφοδος* here virtually assault? *χλεΐη* precedes it here and Hesychius' own gloss of *ἔφοδος* is *ὁρμὴ ἀφίξις ἐπιδρομὴ παρὸνσία βλαβή*. On that assumption *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπεισθαι* would merely refer to the derivation of *ἐψία*.

61: *ἡ μάτην ἰλακτῶ*. It may be worth noting that *ἡ μάτην* beginning a question is the natural outcry of one whose appeal or command is disregarded; cf. Eurip. *Hippol.* 842–43. If in the lack of context we may interpret the passage thus, the third line would then read, *ἅπαντα γάρ τοι τῷ φοβουμένῳ ψοφεῖ*, and would express in iambics another speaker's scorn of the chorus' agitation, as in the well-known scene of the *Septem*. The elliptic use of *γάρ* in implied expostulation would be no difficulty.

106: Mr. Pearson's insistence that *μηδαμοῦ τιμωμένων* is not "nowhere honored" but that *μηδαμοῦ* is felt as genitive of price is a hard saying. Surely there are parallels to the idiomatic use of "nowhere," *nullo loco habere*, etc., in many languages.

116: *ἀγνίσαι* for the supposed meaning "destroy." Mr. Pearson refers to Headlam (*Classical Review*, XVI, 438), on *Anth. Pal.* 7. 49, *ἤγγισε τὰν θνατὰν σώματος ἱστορίαν*, "destroyed the inscription which described Euripides as mortal." But the first two lines of the epigram distinctly say that Euripides himself was killed by the lightning stroke, and something like Bury's *σώματος ἀρμονίαν* is the more plausible reading.

181:

ἀχρεῖος ὦν  
ἐς βρώσιν ἄλλους ἐξερινάζεις λόγῳ.

It is true that Athenaeus in *Eustathius* says παροιμακὸν δὲ αὐτὸ τὸ νόημα ὁμοιον τῷ ἀπαίδεντος ὦν πῶς ἂν ἐτέρους παιδεύσειας. But if, as seems possible, νόημα refers only to the rhetorical use of the antithesis it would not justify any inference as to the substantive meaning or the parallel with Horace's *exsors ipse secandi*.

187:

σὺ δ' αὐτόχειρ γε μητρὸς ἢ σ' ἐγείνατο.

The specific use of δέ γε in retort calls for a note here. It is also overlooked in the index.

229:

τὸν δρῶντα γάρ τι καὶ παθεῖν ὠφείλεται.

Rather more pertinent than the *lex talionis* parallels are those given in my note on Jebb on *Bacchylides* 17, 43 (*Classical Philology*, II, 235).

247. 2:

ἀλλ' εἰς θεοὺς <σ' > ὀρῶντα, καὶ ξῶ δίκη  
χωρεῖν κελεύη, κείω' ὁδοιπορεῖν χρεών.

I cannot see in this a recurrence to the "original" meaning of δίκη, "custom" or "order." It is just a case of hyperbolic rhetoric. A pious Greek did not justify the ways of God to man by the pseudo-scientific reduction of morality to a prehistoric convention or taboo. The principle μηδεὶς τὰ θεῶν ὀνόσασαο sufficed (Theoc. 26. 38; Soph. *Elect.* 1422-23; Aesch. *Choeph.* 830 and 900).

287: In *Schol. Ar. Plut.* 590 ὁ δὲ ἀνελεύθερος κακία παρωνόμασται τῇ ἀνελευθερίῳτι there is probably no intention to affirm that ἀνελεύθερος is derived from ἀνελευθερίῳτης. The meaning is that the one word is in the Aristotelian terminology a "paronym" of the other so that you may argue from the meaning of the one to that of the other.

314. 34: ἐν λόγῳ. The idiom which Mr. Pearson illustrates by Phil. 319, ἐν λόγοις, "unjustly suspected," is further exemplified by Aesch. *Eumen.* 21, ἐν λόγοις πρεσβεύεται, which is often wrongly pressed into explicit antithesis with the preceding ἐν εὐχαῖς. 34. 114: τίς ὁ τρόπος τοῦ τάγματος. The marginal πράγματος is a better and more colloquial reading; cf. the pun in Aristophanes *Wasps* 30. Another colloquialism to add to Mr. Pearson's too brief list for the Ichneutae is 393: ἦδη με πνίγεις καὶ σὺ χαὶ βόες σθέν.

328:

καὶ δὴ τι καὶ παρεῖκα.

This is hardly an apt case of καὶ δὴ καί used to adduce a particular instance in support of a general proposition. τι καὶ are felt closely together with the verb and καὶ δὴ stands by itself introducing the whole.

432: In discussing the discoveries of Palamedes, Mr. Pearson finds an overlooked fragment of Sophocles in *Aristid.* 2, p. 339. Dind. ὡς μὲν γὰρ ἡ τραγωδία φησὶν, 'οὐδὲ τῶν βοσκημάτων οὐδὲν διέφερον' πρὶν ἐκείνῳ συγγενέσθαι. But need this be anything more than Aristides' development of Plato's παγγέλοιον γοῦν· ἔφην· στρατηγὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα ἐν ταῖς τραγωδαῖς Παλαμήδης ἐκάστοτε ἀποφαίνει; (*Rep.* 522 D.)

510: ἔμισγ' ὅσον δὴ πηλὸν ὀργάσαι καλόν.

May not ὅσον δὴ be an example of the indeterminate idiomatic usage illustrated in *Classical Philology*, I, 81? Perhaps we should then read ὀργάσας καλῶς.

568: βίον βραχὺν ἰσθμόν.

This "remarkable figure" might be further illustrated by Pope's "Placed on this isthmus of a middle state," and Moore's "This narrow isthmus twixt two boundless seas."

591: ἐν φῦλον ἀνθρώπων, μὴ ἔδειξε πατρὸς  
καὶ ματρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀμέρα τοὺς πάντας.

Mr. Pearson comments: "What is wanted *might* be obtained by the substitution of ἀ γονά for ἀμέρα, 'our birth . . . proves us all,' i.e., is the hallmark of our equality." I think we may retain ἀμέρα with the aid of Pindar *Pyth.* 4. 254-56.

καὶ ἐν ἄλλοδαπαῖς  
σπέρμ' ἀρούραις τουτάκις ὑμετέρας ἀκτίνος ὄλβον δέξατο μοιρίδιον  
ἄμαρ ἢ νύκτες.

The difficulty disappears if we once apprehend the Greek point of view here and in the glorious lines on the Goddess of Birth *Nem.* 7. 1-4.

592: ἔστι γὰρ πλοῦτός γ' ἀμεμφής (Aesch. *Persae* 171) does not mean that wealth "is in itself harmless," but that no defect can be found in, no fault found with, the Persians' wealth—they are *wealthy* enough; cf. Herod. 7. 48-49: κότερά τοι ὁ πεζὸς μεμπτὸς κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος ἐστι, etc.

646. 4: ἐν γὰρ βραχεὶ καθέειλε, κῶλίγῃ χρόνῳ  
πάμπλουτον ὄλβον δαίμονος κακοῦ δόσις,  
ὅταν μεταστῇ καὶ θεοῖς δοκῇ τάδε.

The objection to the apparent tautology is perhaps lessened if ἐν βραχεὶ is felt rather as a mere idiomatic prepositional phrase. Cf. O.C. 586, fr. 771. 3 *κἂν βραχεὶ διδάσκαλον*, and the collections of Miss Emily Dutton in "Greek Prepositional Phrases" (Chicago dissertation), p. 171 and p. 187; also Pindar, *Pyth.* 8. 98, where the effect of the omission of χρόνῳ is better felt in Myer's "in a little moment" than in Sandys' "short is the space of time."

I think Mr. Pearson reads too much into δαίμονος κακοῦ δόσις when he sees in it the expression of belief in mysterious and destructive powers, etc. It is virtually equivalent to θεοῖς δοκῇ τάδε in the following line. From Homer down δαίμων is a convenient and often interchangeable synonym of θεός. There is no difficulty in δόσις; cf. Theognis 134 with 165, 442-46, 516, 591, 1033, and indeed Greek literature *passim*.

665: ἄκων δ' ἄμαρτῶν οὔτις ἀνθρώπων κακός.

Mr. Pearson still takes seriously the paradox of *Hippias Minor* 371 E ff. Socrates himself with obvious irony tells Hippias that he sometimes does and sometimes doesn't believe it; just now he has an attack of belief and wishes to be refuted by Hippias.

682: παθὼν δ' ἕκαστος ὧν τύχη λέγει.

I don't think that the παθὼν δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνω parallels are quite in point. The thought is rather that of Pindar *Nem.* 4. 91, often misunderstood:

τὰ δ' αὐτὸς ἂν τις ἴδῃ,  
ἐλπεται τις ἕκαστος ἐξοχώτατα φάσθαι.

Note the coincidence in ἕκαστος. We all judge and speak from our own experience, as Mr. Pearson himself interprets.

744: ἀκόλαστον σῶμα. Why not read as the beginning of a trimeter ἀκόλαστον ὄμμα? Cf. Aesch. *Septem* 623, ποδῶκες ὄμμα and Eurip. *Orestes* 10, ἀκόλαστον ἔσχε γλῶσσαν, and the familiar anecdote of Pericles' rebuke of Sophocles οὐ μόνον . . . τὰς χεῖρας δεῖ καθαρὰς ἔχειν . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ὄψεις (Plut. *Per.* c. 3).

746: ἐξαίρετον τίθῃμι τὴν ἀκονσίαν.

Plato *Phaedr.* 242 B Σιμμίαν Θηβαῖον ἐξαιρῶ λόγου is not quite pertinent. It alludes not to the quasi-legal meaning, but to the well-known proverb about excepting the gods.

809: "The conception of Fortune as a goddess of incalculable chance as contrasted with foresight is comparatively late." In view of Pindar, *O.* 12, I do not see how we can deny it to Sophocles. There Pindar passes directly from the invocation of Fortune to the uncertainty of all things and the failure of all human forecasts.

828: εἰς ἀπάντησιν. In view of Photius' ὡς ἐν τῇ συνηθείᾳ φαμέν, it may be worth noting that the phrase is frequent in the *Septuagint*.

831: ἔργον δὲ παντός, ἣν τις ἀρχηται καλῶς,  
καὶ τὰς τελευτὰς εἰκὸς ἐσθ' οὕτως ἔχειν.

The list of "the beginning is half or more than half" parallels including Plato *Rep.* 377 A; and *Leges* 753 E is less pertinent than is another series often overlooked. The apter Platonic parallel is *Rep.* 453 A: ἀρ' οὐχ οὕτως ἂν κάλλιστά τις ἀρχόμενος ὥς τὸ εἰκὸς καὶ κάλλιστα τελευτήσειεν; similarly Pindar *Pyth.* 1. 33:

ναυσιφορήτοις δ' ἀνδράσι πρώτα χάρις  
ἐς πλόον ἀρχομένοις πομπαῖον ἐλθεῖν οὔρον· εὐοικότα γὰρ  
καὶ τελευτᾷ φερέτερον νόστου τυχεῖν,

where interpreters have misunderstood the following ὁ δὲ λόγος through not seeing that it refers to the proverb. Cf. also Antiphon fr. 60 Diels, and the scholiast on Aesch. *Supplices* 118.

865: δεινὸν τὸ τὰς Πειθοῦς πρόσωπον.

We need not attribute a bad meaning to Πειθῶ in order to justify δεινόν. Cf. Aesch. *Prometheus* 37: τὸ συγγενές τοι δεινόν, and Swinburne's amusing imitation:

For there is nothing terribler to men  
Than the sweet face of mothers.

895:                   ἀεὶ γὰρ εὖ πίπτουσιν οἱ Διὸς κύβοι.

The probably intended meaning of this is that which Emerson often gives to it in the version, "The dice of God are always loaded."

I regret that Mr. Pearson has substituted the "new metric" for the system followed by Jebb, and adopted the schemes of Professor Schroeder and Professor White. I wonder if he has really considered the matter. I am sure that no student will be helped by being told that ῥηγνὸς ἀρμονίαν χορδοτόνου λύρας (fr. 244) is an "asclepiad trimeter,"

-----

And after my experience in listening to Professor Wilamowitz I have no idea that Mr. Pearson really reads the line in that way. He only writes it so.

PAUL SHOREY

---

*The Religious Thought of the Greeks from Homer to the Triumph of Christianity.* BY CLIFFORD HERSCHEL MOORE. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1916. Pp. 385. \$2.00.

"In this book eight lectures given before the Lowell Institute in Boston during the late autumn of 1914 are combined with material drawn from a course of lectures delivered the previous spring before the Western Colleges with which Harvard University maintains an annual exchange" (Preface). As a result of this combination the book consists of the following ten lectures: (i) "Homer and Hesiod"; (ii) "Orphism, Pythagoreanism, and the Mysteries"; (iii) "Religion in the Poets of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C."; (iv) "The Fifth Century at Athens"; (v) "Plato and Aristotle"; (vi) "Later Religious Philosophies"; (vii) "The Victory of Greece over Rome"; (viii) "Oriental Religions in the Western Half of the Roman Empire"; (ix) "Christianity"; (x) "Christianity and Paganism." There are also appendixes, giving selected bibliographies and a specimen of a Roman calendar (from the *Fasti Praenestini*), and an index.

To write the history of the religious thought of a thousand years is not a task to be undertaken lightly, and we must respect and admire one who has both undertaken it and accomplished it. Success in this task makes two demands: on the one hand, a quick sympathy with religious values, and a thorough knowledge of the many religious and philosophical systems which fall within the period; on the other, somewhat unusual skill in solving the literary problems of selection and composition.

Professor Moore has written out of full knowledge. One is soon aware of a firm philological foundation underfoot. Each one of the ten topics receives safe and sober treatment. With a few insignificant exceptions, the truth of the statements is not open to question. The book is eminently safe and orthodox. In the quality of sympathy, some of the lectures are better